



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

LAC FTF REGIONAL MEETING, SAN SALVADOR, EL SALVADOR

2011 FINAL REPORT

FEBRUARY 2011

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Weidemann Associates, Inc.

LAC FTF REGIONAL MEETING, SAN SALVADOR, EL SALVADOR

USG LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (LAC) FEED THE FUTURE INITIATIVE REGIONAL MEETING

Authored by:

Mirette Ohman in collaboration with Matt Pierson and Paul Fengler from Weidemann Associates, Inc.

Contracted under RFTOP#SOL-520-11-000003

USG Latin America and the Caribbean Feed the Future Initiative Regional Meeting in San Salvador, El Salvador

DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

LAC FTF REGIONAL MEETING, SAN SALVADOR, EL SALVADOR	2
USG LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (LAC) FEED THE FUTURE INITIATIVE REGIONAL MEETING.....	2
DAY 1: FEBRUARY 16, 2011	4
Registration and Opening Remarks	4
Update on the Bureau for Food Security (BFS) and Feed the Future.....	4
Country Investment Plans for Central America.....	5
Impact Evaluation, Performance Monitoring, and Reporting under FTF.....	6
Climate Change and Food Security	8
Food Security and Nutrition.....	8
Gender and Food security	10
Improving the Supporting Environment for Value Chains	11
USAID Forward and FTF	13
Day 2: February 17, 2011	14
Diplomacy, Policy Reform, and Messaging FTF	14
Private Sector Alliances within Feed the Future.....	16
Closing – Wrap Up and Next Steps	17
Regional Stakeholder’s Meeting	18
Best Practices	18
Annex 1: Agenda.....	20
Annex 2: List of Attendees – LAC Regional FtF Meeting 02/16/2011	25
Annex 3: List of Attendees – LAC Regional FtF Meeting 02/17/2011	27
Annex 4: Evaluation / Feedback Form	30
Annex 5: Acronyms Used in this Report.....	38

DAY 1: FEBRUARY 16, 2011

Registration and Opening Remarks

Summary:

Participants signed-in, received their name tag and a binder containing the agenda, evaluation form, meet and greet invitation, speaker presentations, and blank note cards to jot down questions not addressed during discussions (due to anticipated time constraints). Participants were asked to sit next to someone that they didn't know well. Welcoming remarks were followed by an overview of the agenda, review of the norms for the two days, and an introduction of speakers. A formal introduction of participants was omitted by decision of the organizers who felt the participants were already familiar with one another. Participants were asked to provide a brief evaluation and feedback for each session by indicating the level of met expectations (on a scale of 1 – 5 where “1” represents unfulfilled expectations and “5” represents expectations were fully met) and by providing written concerns, questions, or comments.

Evaluation:

Average Expectation Score: 4.1 (n=8 responses)

Concerns, Questions, or Comments:

- Didn't do introduction of participants, why not?
- Introductions would have been helpful

Update on the Bureau for Food Security (BFS) and Feed the Future

Objective:

Provide an update on BFS and the Initiative

Summary:

- **Update on BFS Structure**
The FtF initiative involves several agencies, among them: Several bureaus within USAID, USDA, State Department, MCC, the Treasury Department (via the WB and other international financial institutions), and the USTR. The need for interagency coordination is both a challenge and an opportunity given that many different agencies play a role.
- **Budget Update**
The budget for the BFS and FtF initiative is characterized by uncertainty in the face of budget cuts. Perhaps the best strategy to protect the intended level of BFS/FtF funding is to make the dollars and cents case (See examples provided in “Wrap-up Session”).
- **Key FTF Thematic Priorities**
Research investments under FtF will focus on three thematic priorities:
 - Advance the productivity frontier breeding and genetics of staple crops and livestock to address major production constraints that pose risks to small scale producers and reach into the future to enhance yield production
 - Transform production systems in areas where the poor are concentrated, leveraging technology advances with applied research for “sustainable intensification” while linking research advances to national partners and programs
 - Enhance nutrition and food safety to improve dietary diversity and health, particularly in women and children

Evaluation:

Average Expectations Score: 4.1 (n=10 responses)

Concerns, Questions, and Comments

- **Structure:**
 - What is the relation among BSF, EGAT, and Regional Bureaus?
- **Budget:**
 - Budget cuts are inevitable, why not focus and concentrate right now on taking back un-programmed FY10 funding for FY11 programs in other countries, thus reducing the work load for less likely missions?
 - Is there parity among the three regions in terms of cuts to the number of countries and the regional programs (field and DC)?
 - Poor defense of Administrator's budget commitment to R & D in the face of budget cuts to bilateral and regional programs that will reduce their ability to improve food security in the near term
 - Need clarity on budget to discuss programs, staffing, government relations
 - Given the budget scenario, staffing expectations (across agencies) are unrealistic
 - Budget constraints should be taken into account
 - Regional Program vulnerability
 - Staffing uncertainty
 - Impact of new responsibilities on USAID
 - Need clear budget guidance – though I know this is difficult given uncertainties and lack of information
- **Key Thematic Priorities - Research and Development**
 - Consider using University Partnerships (between US and local universities) focused on R & D, Science & Technology, then via pilot projects implement in the field. This would include partners from the private sector, NGOs, and government, local capacity building USAID/ Mexico TIES Program. Given the budget scenario, staffing expectations across the Agency are unrealistic.
 - Why can't some R & D funds be used to support action research on field implementation?
 - Research issue: Private and public support to enhance research applied to the field?
 - What is the Norman Borlaug Research Initiative?¹

Country Investment Plans for Central America

Objective:

Develop common understanding of key principles and status within Central America focus countries – Lawrence Rubey, USAID/BFS; Mission Reps (Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Haiti)

Summary:

- **USAID/ECAM**
Focus on areas of greatest potential: 1-Expand market access by reducing barriers to trade and providing more opportunities for smallholder farmers to gain greater access to regional and

¹ **Note:** The Norman Borlaug Commemorative Research Initiative is expected to leverage the world's largest public research system, spanning the USDA's research agencies, to increase relevance and impact on problems and opportunities faced by smallholder farm families in Africa, Asia and Latin America. (See: <http://www.feedthefuture.gov/research.html>)

international markets; 2-Value chains (fresh vegetables and fruits, beans and coffee, seafood and other agricultural products that affect smallholder farmers and vulnerable populations; 3-Regional private sector alliances, harmonized policies, strategies, and information.

- **USAID/Guatemala**

Strategic focal points are: 1-Geographic (Western Highlands); 2-Food Access (increased incomes through horticulture and coffee value chains); 3-Food use (nutrition); and, 4-Transparency & sustainability (municipal governments).

- **USAID/Honduras**

Strategic focal points are: 1-Geographic (Western region); 2-Align with the GOH agriculture strategic goals; 3-Highest growth agricultural products (vegetables and fruits, and specialty coffee); 4-Private sector-based change model that delivers sustainability through profits; 5-Leverage agriculture approach to create income generation opportunities for women; 6-Support Ministry of Health decentralization of child nutrition and growth services to increase access and reduce costs.

- **USAID/ Nicaragua**

A three-pronged approach entails: 1-Increase market-based agriculture among small-holder producers; 2-Support GON development of CIP; 3-Improve nutrition through food production, diet diversification, and messaging.

Evaluation:

Average Expectation Score: 3.6 (n= 8 responses)

Concerns, Questions, and Comments:

- How do you involve the private sector in FtF if significant mistrust exists between the private sector and the government?
- How will Guatemala ensure demand-side, private sector participation to ensure that production lines up with market demand?
- Has Nicaragua determined what parts of an implementation plan they are responsible for producing and set out a matrix identifying what needs to be done, who needs to produce the various parts, how and who will be involved, and when it will be ready?
- More could have been provided by BFS on experience in other countries on how to organize a high level technical review;
- Some wide variances between status of plans and approaches and next steps but this session was very helpful to share status, best practices, and suggestions on how to organize for countries left behind;
- More questions about integration across Central America for FtF
- High level meetings and launch
- Government buy-in to food security / own CIP

Impact Evaluation, Performance Monitoring, and Reporting under FTF

Objective:

To discuss the FTF M&E Approach and what it means for the field.

Summary:

The purpose of the FtF M&E approach is to gather empirical evidence to improve program design and to provide accountability through performance monitoring, impact evaluation, and knowledge management. There are 25 required performance monitoring indicators (2 goal level indicators, 15 high level indicators and 8 whole-of-government indicators attained through an inter-agency consultative process), 28 project

level indicators, and flexibility exists for specific missions to create custom indicators as part of their FtF monitoring framework. Of the 54 indicators, 26 will collect gender related data.

- **Impact Evaluation**
Seeks rigor in establishing causal relationships, intended and unintended effects of interventions and uses experimental and quasi-experimental design (randomization) as well as quantitative and qualitative methodologies.
- **Key Concerns**
FtF M&E entails a huge commitment. It is expensive to implement and it is labor intensive for data collection which could raise staffing concerns. The sources of support for M&E that will interface with USAID are USDA/ERS, Abt Associates, Central M&E contractor, and others.
- **Guidance on FtF baselines**
Contained in a handout. An IQC can be used as a source to collect base-lines in the “zone of influence”. There is no hard and fast rule to determine when data is too old, and the quality of older data needs to be considered on an indicator-by-indicator basis.
- **Reporting results**
For FY11, BFS has developed an interface data system, revamped from the IECA monitoring system that is web-based. The mission enters data and the technical office approves it. This system strives to decrease burden to missions, easy to operate, and implementing partner-friendly.
- **Steps for the next six months**
Missions should
 - Finalize M&E plans
 - Design impact evaluations
 - Collect baselines
 - Integrate M&E indicators into procurements
 - Develop a plan for M&E capacity building with host government
 - Finalize MYS M&E Section

Evaluation:

Average Expectation Score: 3.7 (n= 8 responses)

Concerns, Questions, and Comments

- Is there a percentage of program funds that should be used for M&E? (Mentioned by Dr. Shah in D.C.)
- How will M&E work around (or acknowledge) a time lag between implementation and results?
- There are still a lot of grey areas
- Need to address climate in indicators
- Lots of resources
- Appropriateness of some indicators based on the context for each country
- Lots of information, limited time
- Very comprehensive presentation: Suggest that BFS initiate a program to distribute samples of best practices for scopes of work etc. for data collection
- Good!
- This presentation brought in a whole new dimension (e.g. randomization, experimental design) that has not been addressed in the development of strategic review presentations, guidance for CIPs, and will adversely impact the level of assistance that can be proposed with readily declining budgets;

Climate Change and Food Security

Summary:

- **Key climate change trends in Central America**
1-Temperature rise (causing thermal stress, decreased soil humidity, and a changing distribution of crop pests); 2-Changes in rainfall (droughts/floods); 3-Extreme weather events related to climate change (resulting in crop damage).
- **Key questions on the link between climate trends and food security, including**
 - Crop viability at reasonable resource cost, water costs and availability in the next 10-20 years?
 - Will key crops grow better in certain areas than others?; 3-Do we need to develop new crop varieties and if so, for what climate scenario?; 4-Food/seed stocks for extreme weather events?
- **Key issue**
How do we assess investments in food value chains for improved food security in the light of climate change? Water is a critical input for food security and demand for water could grow as high as 300% by 2050. Evapotranspiration, heavily impacted by climate change, is the single most important factor influencing the volume of water available for use.
- **Integration of climate change into FtF/LAC**
1-Include national climate change specialists in FtF planning boards; 2-Assemble data on climate change scenarios in each FtF country, to better inform planning; 3-Consider climate change scenarios in choice of food value chains to be supported; Ensure consideration of changing water availability in the country.

Evaluation:

Average Expectation Score: 4.3 (n= 6 responses)
Concerns, Questions, and Comments

- Good for sensitization, but not particularly practical
- Very informative
- Need to take into account climate change in value chain priorities
- Need more on effects of lack of water in all aspects of agriculture
- Good perspectives that should help us broaden our selections of Value Chains

Food Security and Nutrition

Objective:

To discuss best practices on integrating nutrition in FTF programming across all USG programs

Summary:

- **USAID Strategic Approach**
 - Prevention of undernutrition in children <2 years of age (1,000 days beginning with prenatal nutrition)
 - Nutrition Service Delivery (micronutrient supplementation and community management of acute undernutrition; and,
 - Country ownership and enabling environment (R&D, M&E, Leadership training and capacity building, policy enabling) for the prevention and service delivery approaches. A FtF first level objective is the improved nutritional status especially of women and children; indicators at this level are the prevalence of stunted (low HAZ-scores), wasted (low WHZ-scores), and underweight (low WAZ-scores) children. Resilience of vulnerable households to hunger,

improved access to diverse and quality foods, improved nutrition-related behaviors and use of MCH and nutrition services are second level objectives. Stability and the body's ability to fully utilize food that is consumed are second-level objective indicators, characterized by programs and policies to reduce economic and social inequities and to promote positive gains in nutritional status, respectively;

- **Game Changers - Prioritize and focus**

- Prevention, targeting the 1,000 days when anthropometric indicators (WAZ, WHZ, and HAZ-scores) typically begin to falter in vulnerable populations
- A multi-sectoral approach to attain diet quality and quantity
- Prevention of undernutrition, by tackling root causes thus reducing the incidence of chronic and, acute undernutrition, which entail extensive and costly treatment and can be life-threatening.

- **Focus 1,000 days**

It is a developmental and political window of greatest opportunity to impact MDGs, and identifies common indicators, while addressing the key challenges and barriers by harnessing power from all sectors, both social and productive. Led by the UN Secretary General's Special Representative for Food Security and Nutrition, with over 100 development partners (donors, civil society, private sector, multilaterals), eight countries are being identified in the next year for improved joint donor collaboration and financing mechanisms, to accelerate action and accountability with governments.

- **Focus: Maximize Agricultural Investments**

Food and non-food agricultural production translates to reduced rates of hunger, improved health and nutritional status when production results in

- Market sales/income generation
- Food kept for household consumption. Nutrition is both an input for and an outcome of agricultural productivity

- **Focus: New Conceptual Frameworks**

The strategy and inventions entail policies and investments, social protection, and targeted programs which on the macro level impact the economic system and key sectors: trade and infrastructure, agriculture, health, and education. On the micro level they impact households and individuals. In the real world, the system is often disrupted by external shocks which are natural and man-made in nature. Resiliency to external shocks allows uninterrupted progress in nutritional status, capacity and productivity, as well as in economic and social development.

- **Key Take Aways**

Open Dialogue on FtF (40 mission staff from 20 countries attended) New Delhi, India – February 9, 2011

- Scale up successful interventions - need additional capacity support
- Design ag, nutrition and health programs with cross sectoral benefits - Coordination and consistency in M&E across FTF and GHI
- Incorporate nutrition value chains for food products - Need guidance for FtF strategic partners to measure and report progress
- Use all available levers for change to maximize potential
- Strengthen communication on best practices and global efforts that affect implementation at the country level

Evaluation:

Average Expectation Score: 3.8 (n= 9 responses)

Concerns, Questions, and Comments

- How should missions balance their focus on acute malnutrition (MDG 1.c) versus chronic malnutrition (stunting)?
- Where does school feeding fit into the nutrition strategies that focus on children <2 years of age?

- How is USDA's Food and Nutrition Service involved in the FtF nutritional components?
- Where are the R&D programs for nutrition? INCAP is not mentioned in Slide 7 under LAC Research Center. Is there not a Nutrition CRSP? What will it do?
- I think that we should have more guidelines
- Great IFPRI feedback
- Nutrition examples are good
- Blasted with tons of information, hard to digest
- Lots of information, limited time
- Need greater Washington coordination of health budgets in FTF countries so there is a coordinated approach and funding for nutrition
- Most charts are unreadable
- Emphasis was on ideas - I would have preferred more tools and practical approaches

Gender and Food security

Objective:

To share information on how results of gender assessment led to a concrete change in missions' strategy

Summary:

- **Gender assessments reveal that in value chain development you need**
 - Gender analysis in the design phase
 - Consideration of the roles and the potential for men and women throughout the value chain (not just in production or existing gender roles) in the analysis
 - Indicators need to be established and continually monitored. Furthermore, an understanding of men's and women's roles and relations support value chain programs and gender equity goals. Approaches that target men and women with agricultural interventions ensure equitable membership policies in associations, as community extension volunteers, consider husband/wife teams as lead farmers, view farming as a family business, among others.
- **Key Questions**
In the positive deviance model, why are some women able to move out of traditional roles, and how can more move (especially those women engaged in unpaid labor)? Several NGOs excel in providing micro-financing and other financial services. Can we gather good models?
- **Promotion of Gender Impacts of FtF Investments**
 - Establish sex-disaggregated targets
 - track impacts of investments on men and women
 - Measure the progress of women's achievements related to men's. Part of our challenge with gender outcomes is that our lack of measurement has hidden our successes and failures.
- **Important Programming areas**
 - Increase options for family planning
 - Access to land
 - Improve health (especially pregnant) women
 - Increase access to fuel and water
 - For indigenous groups, the intersection between gender and ethno-cultural identity; Gender-based violence; Boys and young men – schooling violence (leading to high dropout rates, and increased risk of being a victim of homicide).
- **Tips for Integrating Gender into USAID Ag Solicitations**
Ensure that the requiring office integrates gender issues into the procurement request, the different performance components of an RFP or RFA (SOW, program description, deliverables, key personnel

qualifications, M&E). In addition, gender is to be reflected in the corresponding technical evaluation (RFP) or technical selection criteria (APs).

- **Recommendations for Gender Integration**

- Develop and implement a gender integration policy;
- Provide resources and technical assistance to partner organizations, including training;
- Consider guidelines/targets to including women in leadership of cooperatives and producer groups
- Support gender analysis and research in the current rural development model;
- Investigate options of working with national statistics institute for collection and reporting sex-disaggregated data.

Evaluation:

Average Expectation Score: 4.0 (n= 6 responses)

Concerns, Questions, and Comments

- More tools would have been helpful
- How to integrate gender ideas were good
- Excellent presentation

Improving the Supporting Environment for Value Chains

Objective:

Update on USAID Research and Development programs and how they apply to value chains (horticulture, coffee, and beans) and agribusiness and trade in the region

Summary:

- **Research and Development**

- The presenter for Research and Development (R&D) was not able to attend the meeting. The following are excerpts from the R&D PowerPoint presentation submitted for participant review and discussion. The FtF Initiative is aligned with GOH Agriculture strategic goals.
- Country Context – Honduras: Western Honduras is home to chronic malnutrition (>50%) and vulnerable groups (women headed households -40%, and highest concentration of indigenous). Focused investment in the West will have the greatest impact towards achieving MDG1, leveraging synergies between agricultural and nutrition interventions, and, reducing transaction costs (increased results per dollar invested).
- Pursue a Private Sector-Based Agricultural Change Model that Delivers Sustainability through Profits: 1-Focus on the two highest growth agricultural products suitable to the West, vegetables and fruits; and, specialty coffee and assist small farmers to effectively respond to market standards; 2-Foster relationships with brokers to provide clear market signals to farmers on market standards; 3-Develop strong market relationships to facilitate credit; and, 4-Address value chain constraints through private sector policy advocacy;
- FtF Baseline Scenario Illustrative Targets 2011- 2015: Reduced Poverty (MDG1) among 36,000 households (180,000 people); New net small business sales (\$100 million); New full-time equivalent employment (10,000 positions); New business investment (\$20 million); 20% decrease in stunting rates among 5 year-olds; 20% decrease in prevalence of underweight children; 20% increase in the prevalence of breast feeding of children less than 6 months of age.

- **Doing Agribusiness in LAC Assessment**

- The Value Chain Focus of Assessment entails coffee and horticulture in all three focus countries (Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua) as well as beans in Nicaragua;
- The Technical Focus of Assessment entails: 1-A premise that increased investment in agribusiness is vital to creating jobs and raising incomes in “value chains”; 2-Low purchasing power (access) is a root cause of food insecurity; 3-Operational and strategic recommendations can be used in preparing or refining each Mission’s multi-year FtF strategy, programming, and in engaging stakeholders in preparing CIPs;
- The Value Chain Focus of Assessment entails coffee and horticulture in all three focus countries (Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua) as well as beans in Nicaragua.
- The Assessment Framework
 - USAID actions (Country-specific multi-year FtF strategies and program design)
 - Strategic and operational constraints (market access/competitiveness, credit, finance, investment, infrastructure, climate change, security and corruption, government)
 - FtF indicators (how farm / chain operation impacts availability, income, access, and nutrition). Assessment methodologies use field activities to draft recommendations, pair priorities, and formulate strategic and operational recommendations.
- Preliminary Recommendations – Operational Examples
 - Strengthen “asociatividad” in chains through anchor companies providing a top-down approach to reach individual producers and through farmer groups
 - Develop small-scale irrigation projects, including local water management capacities
 - Implement land tenure and titling project in Nicaragua and Guatemala, with a special focus on women in Guatemala.
- Preliminary Recommendations – Strategic Examples
 - Develop DCA guarantee programs for selected chains and regions
 - Collaborate w/donors to support upgrading secondary and feeder roads to access markets in Western Highlands in Guatemala and the North Central Highlands in Nicaragua
 - Strengthen and make more open and accessible government institutions directly impacting on “doing agribusiness”.

Evaluation:

Research and Development

Average Expectation Score: 1 (n= 2 responses)

Concerns, Questions, and Comments

- For Margaret Enis: Thoughts on GMO / modified seeds?
- What is “Analogous Transfer”?
- R&D presentation does not include technology transfer. In most cases this is the broken link and it would help to understand what worked on achieving this change
- It is not clear how local universities / research institutions are involved. It is necessary to strengthen this capacity to support the government on making decisions of facts and with support of local / nationals
- I didn’t see anything about South – South research and trilateral assistance such as technology developed in Brazil (Embrapa). Should this be included as a resource?
- It would have been useful to have a clearer link between the CRSP and CGIAR on addressing the actual needs of program implementation. Research topics are the same but how to make sure that they are aiming in the same direction
- One-half of this session was missing, it could have been substituted
- Should have had a back-up for R&D

- Doing Agribusiness in LAC
Average Expectation Score: 3.75 (n= 4 responses)
Concerns, Questions, and Comments
 - Would have liked to have seen how to overcome constraints (market access/competitiveness, credit, finance, investment, infrastructure, climate change, security and corruption, government)
 - I expected more information on key value chain investments
 - Note from LAC Agribusiness Assessment presenter regarding GMO / Modified seeds: I recall that our former food security lead (David Hull) expressed great concern about the “viability” of GMO seeds, if we are talking about the basic food crops grown by the indigenous people in the highlands (be it Central America or the Andean region). There is a big push for GMO seed for Africa from companies like Monsanto—and maybe GMOs can be a good fit for Africa. But the FTF programs the USAID Missions are designing for Central America are NOT focused primarily on basic food crops (grains) with the exception of beans in the case of Nicaragua—the focus is on coffee (perhaps there is GMO coffee?) and horticulture crops (in all 3 countries). I don’t hear discussion of GMO snow peas, etc.) – growers use the seeds for the varieties that the market/buyers want (and I suspect it is not the case, as with grain crops such as corn, of saving snow pea seed from this season’s harvest for next season’s planting). I’m no expert on GMOs but I suspect that for these smaller niche markets (i.e., the high-value horticulture crops), the private sector is not investing research \$ in developing GMO melon seeds – though companies are probably breeding (the traditional way) for improved varieties. There’s also the issue of labeling – whether GMO-derived horticultural products could be sold into domestic or export markets without full disclosure – “this is a genuine GMO-derived & organically grown watermelon” – which might put off buyers/consumers. So my take on the issue – and I could be wrong – is that this may be non-issue UNLESS USAID wants to help those focus farmers with farmers in raising the productivity of their corn and beans by using GMO seed – and I don’t recall any Mission proposing to do that.

USAID Forward and FTF

Objective:

To provide an overview of the agency’s procurement reform and discuss the implications for FTF implementation

Summary:

- Reforms are designed to increase the effectiveness of USAID’s foreign assistance efforts, enhance competition and broaden our partner base, and increase transparency of how the Agency implements its programs.
- Objectives and Steps to achieve them:
 - Strengthen host government capacity to improve aid effectiveness and sustainability – An assessment tool and policy guidance on the use of partner country systems are being developed and will be piloted in four countries.
 - Strengthen civil society and private sector capacity by supporting local entities who can take greater ownership over the development of their countries – Implementing partner agreements will have built-in metrics and capacity building objectives. Established & trained pilot capacity development teams for outreach.
 - Increase competition and broaden our partner base – Revise and streamline RFP, RFA, and CRB procedures, increase set asides, require that prime contractors use local nonprofit / private

business and US small or disadvantaged businesses as subcontractors for not only administrative support but programmatic components, with enforcement to ensure compliance.

- Use USG resources more efficiently and effectively. FOG format allows advances, upfront milestone payment, and simplified payment for performance. – Increase the number of fixed price contracts, break up large IQCs into smaller ones, harmonize procurement approaches with other USG agencies working in the same substantive areas, set individual task order ceilings under IQCs, review the use of time and material contracts for activities over 90 days, among others.
- Strengthen collaboration and partnership with other bilateral donors and multilateral and international organizations. – Revise policies and provisions applicable to grants with PIOs, negotiate and draft new model agreements with PIOs (UN, WB) and for donor cooperation at the field level to jointly fund development assistance, review regulations concerning basket or pooled funds to allow increased USAID participation, and harmonize grant and reporting requirements with other donors in consultation with local NGOs.
- Rebuild USAID's internal technical capacity and rebalance the workforce. – Talent Reform plan – prioritize recruitment of technical staff, and retention of Cos.

Evaluation:

Average Expectation Score: 3.9 (n= 7 responses)

Concerns, Questions, or Comments

- Good job, Lawrence
- Well presented but key issues remain about applicability of procurement reforms given timing and need for immediate results
- Need to involve local partners; – increase in workload for COTR; - questions about the capacity of local partners to deliver
- Speaker told us about FOG – which is more like a contract than a grant; -speaker did not answer the question on why USAID is not encouraged to contract with local partners
- Good overview but would have been better if a contracting officer and general counsel officer were helping to present

DAY 2: FEBRUARY 17, 2011

Diplomacy, Policy Reform, and Messaging FTF

Summary:

- **What the State Department is looking for in the multi-year strategies include**
 - Solid and well-focused CIPs
 - Whole of government approach
 - Identifying and addressing policy constraints
 - Regional policies that complement and build upon individual country strategies
 - Coordination with other donors
 - Tangible outcomes
 - Public-private partnerships
 - Integration of agricultural and nutrition programs
 - Monitoring and success stories, among others
- **Dimensions of State's Diplomatic Support for FtF**
 - Diplomatic engagement with host governments

- Donor coordination, including GAFSP
- Encouraging key trade and agriculture policies in regional and multilateral forum
- Strategic partnerships and strategic dialogues
- Commercial outreach, public diplomacy, and other embassy FtF Support
- **Donor Coordination**
 - In Washington, track implementation of L'Aquila \$22 billion commitments and encouragement of support for GAFSP
 - Press donors to align funding with country programs
 - At Post, leverage Ambassador and DCM as appropriate
 - Support for high level events
- **Encouraging Key Trade and Agriculture Policies (in global, regional and multilateral forum)**
 - Encourage constructive policies to mitigate price volatility
 - Encourage appropriate land tenure and property rights regimes
 - Encourage policies that will attract investment
- **Diplomatic Engagement with Host Governments on the Policy Enabling Environment**
 - Place FtF in the context of broader USG economic goals
 - Advise on policy constraints identified through analytic process and advocate for reforms and increased host country investment
 - Involvement of COM and DCM at important windows of opportunity
 - Emphasize cross-cutting issues of gender and environment / climate change
- **Feed the Future Support**
 - Advise on policy constraints that affect food security
 - Contribute towards developing strategic partnerships and dialogues
 - Work with potential donors to achieve tangible contributions as part of the work with GAFSP
 - Advance agriculture through biotechnology to further policy and acceptance as well as regulatory frameworks
 - Diplomacy
 - Interagency coordination
 - Communication/planning
 - Private sector outreach
 - Ramp up the SUN/Thousand Day Initiative
- **Public Diplomacy – Ideas for Messaging**
 - Global hunger is a huge, vital challenge
 - Work together – government, donors, private sector, and civil society
 - With a comprehensive approach, we can be successful
 - Importance of cross-cutting issues: Gender, climate change, and nutrition
 - USG is committed – One of our top priorities.

Evaluation:

Average Expectation Score: 3.5 (n=5 responses)

Concerns, Questions, or Comments

- Can the diplomatic strategy include getting license of Monsanto technology (biotech) for local universities that can develop ag products that make sense locally and don't compete with commercial products?

- Will the diplomatic strategy include having USDA adopt a less costly system to approve MGO's so that not only igb companies can go commercial?
- Surprising that State speaker could not answer the question on the focus of responsibility within State (or BFS) to track which donors are providing funds to which countries in support of GAFSP.
- Good information, but the speaker did not appear prepared.
- Support for FtF from State at mission level

Private Sector Alliances within Feed the Future

Summary:

The Environmental and Labor Excellence for CAFTA – DR program was created to support the CAFTA-DR signatory countries to improve and effectively enforce their existing environmental and labor laws by strengthening government institutions, improving private sector environmental performance, and creating market alliances to adopt voluntary labor and environmental standards. Market alliances goals are to 1- Develop and foster the adoption of environmental and labor standards through alliances with major regional and international buyers in different products; and, 2-Work with the private sector in CAFTA-DR countries to assist with compliance of these voluntary standards, leading to new regional and international markets. Alliances are market driven.

- **Win-Win Strategy Good for the Business**
 - Generate differentiated products and increase competitiveness Comply with the present and future environmental legislation (CAFTA-DR, Ch. 16 & 17)
 - Improve quality control and reduce the risk of complaints by final buyers
 - Facilitate access to financial resources to invest in production improvements aligned with standards compliance
- **Good for the Environment and People**
 - Reduce the toxicological risk during production
 - Runoff / effluents reduction and optimize water use
 - Ecological footprint reduction
 - Increase labor safety during production and processing
 - Improve the quality of life in surrounding communities. Case studies conducted in Guatemala with 97 producers cultivating 3,000 Ha suggest that 56% of the producers achieved certification and their agricultural practices resulted in a 64% reduction in runoff, used 30% less water for irrigation, and applied 56% fewer pesticides
- **Current Alliances**

Producers and Products: In four countries (Guatemala, El Salvador, Costa Rica and Nicaragua) we work with nine producers (Broccoli, melon, okra, pineapple, Mahi-mahi) as well as may processors and exporters. Brokers and repackers sell to wholesalers or big retailers such as Costco, SAM's, and Winn Dixie. These alliances entail large-scale retailers, processors, wholesalers, producers and in some cases, food services that are vertically integrated. Producers and processors enter into a signed alliance, while the wholesaler provides financial support to the producers. Environmental and labor standards provided by NSF, GlobalGap, and Davis Fresh.
- **Linkages with Feed the Future Global Commitment**
 - Collaboration and flexible partnerships with the private sector
 - Technical assistance leading to economic growth for small farmers
 - Strategic and tailor-made investments at field levels that ensure sustainable financial returns

- Support access to new markets.

Evaluation:

Average Expectation Score: 4.8 (n=5 responses)

Concerns, Questions, or Comments

- Great information, gave missions ideas on potential GDAs; Need more information on how headquarters will manage GDAs with the field that are created at headquarters.
- Thought-provoking and highly entertaining
- Best presenter of the workshop

Closing – Wrap Up and Next Steps

- **Key Concerns**
 - Increased budget clarity in an environment of uncertainty
 - Help Missions navigate multiple USAID bureaus
 - Provide REAL TDY support in some key areas
- **Upcoming Milestones**
 - Strategy approval
 - Procurement Plans (Mapping FtF portfolio against key procurement instruments –e.g. table format)
 - Timeline from implementation to results?

- **Support for Budget Clarity**

- Demonstrate cost efficiency by effectively articulating results
- Example:

USAID has helped over 17,000 farmers (60 percent women) increase production of horticulture products by 35 percent. As a result, we have spurred over \$51 million in additional exports by these farmers, increasing their incomes by 28 percent on average. Poverty rates in the target zone (people living on under \$1.25 per day) have fallen from 54% to 46%.

- Demonstrate cost efficiency by effectively articulating “Proto-Results”
- Example:

USAID has signed an innovative local grant with Cooperativa XYZ that will expand the numbers of farmer members growing high-value horticulture products from 8,000 to 20,000. For the first time, the cooperative has a majority of women on their Junta Directiva. By providing secure contracts with key private sector buyers, sales by farmers are expected to grow 42 percent over the next two years, increasing household’s incomes by 12 percent. Also, as a result of USAID funding, the cooperative has recently added a nutrition home visit program to their extension efforts that will improve dietary diversity for over 5,000 children.

- **Additional Participant Comments**

- There was a lot of specific focus on Central America, i.e. leaving out Haiti. Perhaps next time could be more inclusive.
- It would be very helpful to have a list of participants. Thanks!

Regional Stakeholder's Meeting

Objective:

Share information on how similar or diverse LAC countries are in readiness to implement the food security initiative

Summary:

A total of 35 attendees representing 25 stakeholder organizations operating in the Central American region participated in a 2 hour and 45 minute meeting to share information. During that session the USAID / BSF and USAID ECAM representatives shared with stakeholders a description of the global Feed the Future Initiative and the ECAM and bilateral FtF strategy, respectively.

Patricia Palma delivered an hour long presentation on the role of SICA and its sub-systems in food security and nutrition on behalf of Dr. Juan Daniel Aleman who was unable to attend. In addition, Ms. Palma presented information on the Regional Program for Food Security and Nutrition for Central America (PRESANCA/EU) including such topics as the status of food security in Central America and the results of PRESANCA 1.

The session was followed by a presentation from Camela Gallardo, Special Program for Food Security (PESA / FAO), who reviewed the work of that Program and also covered the important topic of food security policy and laws in Central America. The Regional Stakeholder's Meeting concluded with a panel discussion.

Best Practices

Weidemann Associates, Inc. identifies several areas of success and recommends changes in action for even greater success in the future.

There are several Best Practices in logistical planning that were identified:

- Strong teamwork within the USAID / El Salvador Mission and the meeting organizers at USAID in Washington, D.C. was a critical element contributing towards successes during the meeting. This also allowed the contractor (WAI) to seamlessly integrate into the team upon approval of the Work Assignment.
- Innovation to meet tailored needs, as well as clear and open communication among internal and external team members on all levels lead to thoughtfully crafted logistics.
- Flexibility by all parties to quickly and adeptly make contingency plans allowed last minute adjustments to be made.
- Creating and nurturing a team culture of shared responsibility led to successful meetings.

Lessons Learned

The team learned three key lessons that will be essential to keep in mind for future meetings:

- Late receipt of presentation materials significantly increases meeting costs (especially photocopying), jeopardizes the quality of document review needed for planning and for organizing reports, and it diverts staff energy away from productive and programmed tasks.
- Communication throughout the planning process promotes seamless teamwork, positively impacting the quality of the meeting.

- Clear identification of the division of roles and tasks amongst all the participating parties is important so that work is not duplicated.

ANNEX I:AGENDA

Agenda USG Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) Regional Feed the Future Meeting

San Salvador, El Salvador

February 16-17, 2011

Day 1: February 16, Hotel Sheraton, San Salvador, El Salvador.

Time	Title	Speakers/ Panelists	Format
7:30 – 8:00	Registration		
8:00 – 8:30	Welcome and Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome remarks• Opening• Introduction of Participants and Overview of agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ECAM/Carl Derrick• LAC/Doug Ball• <i>Facilitator</i>	USG only
8:30 – 9:45	Update on the Bureau for Food Security (BFS) and Feed the Future <i>Objective:</i> Provide an update on BFS and the Initiative <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Update on BFS structure• Budget Update• Key FTF Thematic Priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• BFS/Lawrence Rubey	USG only
9:45-10:15	Coffee Break		

10:15-11:15	Country Investment Plans for Central America <i>Objective:</i> Develop common understanding of key principles and status within Central America focus countries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key principles of a Country Investment Plan • Key steps in the process of CIP development and finalization • Update from each country on current status 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BFS/Lawrence Rubey • Mission reps readout 	USG only
11:15-12:30	Title: Impact Evaluation, Performance Monitoring, and Reporting under FTF <i>Objective:</i> To discuss the FTF M&E Approach and what it means for the field. Description: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This session will focus on the FTF M&E Approach, M&E support for Missions, baselines, M&E in FTF Procurements, and reporting requirements. • Brief presentation with Q&A sessions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BFS/Emily Hogue 	USG only
12:30-1:30	Lunch – Climate Change and Food Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECAM/Paul Schmidtke 	USG only
1:30-2:45	Food Security and Nutrition <i>Objective:</i> To discuss best practices on integrating nutrition in FTF programming across all USG programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Readout from the IFPRI meetings in India 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GH/Roshelle Payes 	USG only

2:45-3:30	Gender and Food security <i>Objective:</i> To share information on how results of gender assessment led to a concrete change in missions' strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BFS/Sylvia Cabus 	USG only
3:30-4:00	Coffee Break		
4:00-5:00	Improving the Supporting Environment for Value Chains: <i>Objective:</i> Update on USAID Research and Development programs and how they apply to value chains (horticulture, coffee, and beans) and agribusiness and trade in the region <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on the direction of USAID-funded R&D programs Update on "Doing Agribusiness in LAC" assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BFS/Margaret Enis LAC/Kerry Byrnes 	USG only
5:00-5:30	USAID Forward and FTF <i>Objective:</i> To provide an overview of the agency's procurement reform and discuss the implications for FTF implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BFS/Lawrence Rubey 	USG only
5:30-5:45	Daily wrap up	Facilitator	USG only

- Day 2: February 17, Hotel Sheraton, San Salvador, El Salvador.**

Time	Title	Speakers/ Panelists	Format
8:15-8:30	Overview of Agenda for Day 2	Facilitator	
8:30-9:30	Diplomacy, Policy Reform, and Messaging FTF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State's views on the multi-year strategy State's diplomacy role 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State/Robin Matthewman 	USG only

9:30-10:30	Private Sector Alliances within Feed the Future <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable CAFTA-DR Alliances USAID Alliances, Past and Present 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ECAM/Gerardo Tablas CAFTA-DR/Carlos Morales BFS/ Jay Daniliuk 	USG only
10:30-10:45	Coffee Break		
10:45-11:45	Bilateral – Regional synergy <i>Objective:</i> Discuss regional programming, including the USDA MOU for SPS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ECAM/Michelle Jennings LAC/Tracy Quilter or Alice Brooks 	USG only
11:45-12:15	Set up for lunch		
12:15 – 1:15	Lunch <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FTF Global Overview E-CAM and Bilateral FTF Strategy Presentations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BFS/Lawrence Rubey USAID Mission reps 	Open session
1:15 – 1:35	<i>Central American Integration System (SICA)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Role of SICA and its Subsystems in Food Security and Nutrition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dr. Juan Daniel Aleman 	Open session
1:35 – 2:05	<i>Regional Program for Food Security and Nutrition for Central America (PRESANCA/EU)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Status of Food Security in Central America Results of PRESANCA I 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patricia Palma 	Open session
2:05 – 2:35	<i>The Special Program for Food Security (PESA/FAO)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food Security Policy and Laws in Central America 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carmelo Gallardo 	Open session
2:35 – 3:00	Stakeholder Q & A		Panel Discussion

3:00-3:15	Coffee Break		
3:15-4:15	Meeting with Wal-Mart <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical meeting on proposed regional alliance (see attached annotated agenda) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USAID/Food Security Team Wal-Mart/Jorge Cordero, Robert Kenny 	USG only
4:15 – 5:00	Closing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wrap up Next Steps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ECAM/Michelle Jennings 	USG only

ANNEX 2: LIST OF ATTENDEES – LAC REGIONAL FTF MEETING 02/16/2011

USG Only meetings February 16-17

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Bureau/Mission</u>	<u>email</u>
Doug Ball	Office Director	USAID	LAC/RSD	dball@usaid.gov
Tracy Quilter	Team Leader	USAID	LAC/RSD	tquilter@usaid.gov
Alice Brooks	Food Security Advisor	USAID	LAC/RSD	abrooks@usaid.gov
Kerry Byrnes	Trade Advisor	USAID	LAC/RSD	kbyrnes@usaid.gov
Lawrence Rubey		USAID	BFS	lrubey@usaid.gov
Amy Sink		USAID	BFS	asink@usaid.gov
Emily Hogue		USAID	BFS	ehogue@usaid.gov
Roshelle Payes		USAID	BFS	rpays@usaid.gov
Sylvia Cabus		USAID		sacabus@af-sd.org
Jay Daniliuk		USAID	BFS	jdaniuk@usaid.gov
Dionandrea "Dee" Shorts	Regional Officer, Office of Central American Affairs	State		ShortsD@state.gov
Robin Matthewman		State		matthewmanrh@state.gov
Jennifer Tikka	EG Office Director	USAID	Guatemala	jtikka@usaid.gov
David Delgado		USAID	Guatemala	ddelgado@usaid.gov
Todd Hamner	EG Office Director	USAID	Honduras	thamner@usaid.gov
Hector Santos		USAID	Honduras	hrosantos@usaid.gov
David Castellanos		USAID	Honduras	dcastellanos@usaid.gov
Phillip Palmer		USAID	Haiti	ppalmer@usaid.gov
James Woolley	Ag officer	USAID	Haiti	jwoolley@usaid.gov
Olbeg Desinor	Health officer	USAID	Haiti	odesinor@usaid.gov
Pierre C. Milfort	Food Security Information Specialist	USAID	Haiti	pmilfort@usaid.gov
Judith Timyan		USAID	Health/Guatemala	JTimyan@usaid.gov
Bob Hoff	Agricultural Counselor	USDA	FAS/Guatemala	robert.hoff@fas.usda.gov
Karla Tay	Agricultural Counselor	USDA	FAS/Guatemala	karla.tay@fas.usda.gov
Luis Guzman	Private Enterprise Officer	USAID	Nicaragua	lguzman@usaid.gov
Rebecca Krzywda	Deputy Mission Director	USAID	Nicaragua	rkrzywda@usaid.gov
Norma Parker	Mission Director	USAID	Nicaragua	nparker@usaid.gov
Miguel Herrera	Especialista Agricola	USDA	El Salvador	miguel.herrera@fas.usda.gov
Michelle Jennings	EG Office Director	USAID	El Salvador	mjennings@usaid.gov
Tom McAndrews	EG Deputy Office Director	USAID	El Salvador	tmcandrews@usaid.gov
Alicia Contreras	Private Enterprise Officer	USAID	El Salvador	acontreras@usaid.gov
Gabriela Montenegro		USAID	El Salvador	gmontenegro@usaid.gov
Rafael Cuellar		USAID	El Salvador	racuellar@usaid.gov
Paul Schmidtke		USAID	El Salvador	pschmidtke@usaid.gov
Melissa Francis	SDO - Office Director	USAID	El Salvador	mefrancis@usaid.gov
Gerardo Tablas		USAID	El Salvador	gtablas@usaid.gov
Nora Pinzon		USAID	El Salvador	npinzon@usaid.gov

Margarita Diaz	Admin Staff	USAID	El Salvador	mdiaz@usaid.gov
Mirette Ohman	Weidemann Associates			miretteo@hotmail.com
Matt Pierson	Weidemann Associates			mpierson@weidemannassoc.com

ANNEX 3: LIST OF ATTENDEES – LAC REGIONAL FTF MEETING 02/17/2011

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>email</u>
Alberto Cuéllar González		ACDI/VOCA	LCuellar@acdivoca.org
Olga del Pino	coordinadora del eje de profundización de la integración económica del Fondo España-SICA	Agencia de Cooperación Española	odelpino@sica.int
Pedro Caldentey del Pozo	Asesor Principal Fondo España-SICA	Agencia de Cooperación Española	pcaldentey@sica.int
Señora Dora Arriola		CARE Centroamérica	haroldo.chiquin@ca.care.org
Pastor Antonio Vilchez		CARE Centroamérica	pastor.vilchez@ca.care.org
Richard Jones		Catholic Relief Service	rjones@crs.org.sv
José Novelo		Comisión Centroamericana de Ambiente y Desarrollo, CCAD	jnovelo@sica.int
Mauricio Peñalba		European Union	Mauricio.Penalba@ec.europa.eu
Carmelo Gallardo	Programa Especial para la Seguridad Alimentaria en Centroamérica (PESA III)	Food and Agriculture Organization	carmelo.gallardo@fao.org
Ervin F. Leiva	Country Director	Food for the Hungry	eleiva@fh.org
Roger Miranda Gómez		FOPREL	foprel@ibw.com.ni
Iván Aguilar Sandoval	Coordinador de Emergencias CA	Fundación ACCIÓN CONTRA EL HAMBRE	coorder-ca@acf-e.org
Ana Victoria Román	Coordinadora, Unidad Técnica de Nutrición y Micronutrientes	Instituto de Nutrición de Centroamérica y Panamá, INCAP	aroman@incap.int
Carolina Siu Bermúdez	Directora	Instituto de Nutrición de Centroamérica y Panamá, INCAP	csiu@incap.int
Dr. Hernán Delgado	Investigador Emérito	Instituto de Nutrición de Centroamérica y Panamá, INCAP	hdelgado@incap.int ; hldelgadov@gmail.com
Ing. Gerardo Merino	Coordinador Cooperación Técnica del INCAP en El Salvador	Instituto de Nutrición de Centroamérica y Panamá, INCAP	gmerino@incap.int
Dr. Gerardo Escudero		Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura (IICA)	gescuder@iica.org.sv
Dr. James French	Director de Cooperación Técnica del IICA	Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura (IICA)	james.french@iica.int
Dr. Steve Beebe	Bean Program Leader	International Center for Tropical Agriculture - CIAT	s.beebe@cgiar.org

María Eugenia Baltodano	Oficina Managua, Nicaragua	International Center for Tropical Agriculture - CIAT	m.e.baltodano@cgiar.org
Hugo Solano		Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)	solanohugo.el@jica.co.jp ; stephanieehhardt.el@jica.go.jp
Bill Weaver		Lutheran World Relief	biweaver@lwr.org
Mario Rodríguez		MFEWS	
Ketty Tedeschi		Oficina de Cooperacion Italiana	cooperazione.sansalvador@esteri.it
Daniel Rodríguez		Organización del Sector Pesquero y Acuícola del Istmo Centroamericano (OSPESCA)	irodriguez@oirca.org
Jorge López Mendoza		Organización del Sector Pesquero y Acuícola del Istmo Centroamericano (OSPESCA)	peony@live.com.ar
Ing. Jorge Villacorta		Parlamento Centroamericano	xochiltzepeda@hotmail.com ; jorgevillacortasv@gmail.com
Patricia Palma de Fulladolsa	Directora	Programa Regional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional para Centroamérica, PRESANCA	ppalma@sica.int
Daysi de Marquez		Programa Regional de Sistemas de Información en Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional, PRESISAN	dmarquez@sica.int
Gersande Chávez		Save The Children	GChavez@savechildren.org
Irma Yolanda Nuñez		Secretaría de Inclusión Social	inunez@inclusion-social.gob.sv
Ernesto Torres-Chico		Secretaría de Integración Económica Centroamericana, SIECA	sieca@pronet.net.gt
Sergio Bran	Director de Investigación y Política Social	Secretaría de la Integración Social Centroamericana, SISCA	sbran@sica.int
Dra. Lily Caravantes		Secretaría de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional (SESAN)	lily.caravantes@sesan.gob.gt ; silvia.dematta@sesan.gob.gt
Rolando Hernández		Secretaría del Consejo de Ministros de Salud de Centroamérica, COMISCA	rhernandez@sica.int
Patricia Ramírez		Secretaría Ejecutiva de la Comisión Regional de Recursos Hidráulicos, CRRH	probando@ice.co.cr
Julio O. Calderón Artieda		Secretaría Ejecutiva del Consejo Agropecuario Centroamericano, CAC	julio.calderon@iica.int
Dr. Juan Daniel Alemán		Sistema de la Integración Centroamericana (SICA)	ljimenez@sica.int
Lic. Edgar Chamorro Marín	Director Ejecutivo	Sistema de la Integración Centroamericana (SICA)	ECHAMORRO@SICA.INT
Gordon Jonathan Lewis		UNICEF	lehuezo@unicef.org
Miguel Gómez	Director	Unidad Regional de Asistencia Técnica (RUTA)	
Claudia de Morales		United Nations Development	claudia.morales@undp.org

Dr. Alfredo Arriaza	Coordinador de la Unidad de Nutricion	Programme World Food Program	alfredo.arriaza@wfp.org;margarita.mendizabal@wfp.org
Sr. Elbyn Ramirez	Oficial de Programa de Seguridad Alimentaria y Gestion de Riesgos	World Food Program	elbyn.ramirez@wfp.org;margarita.mendizabal@wfp.org

ANNEX 4: EVALUATION / FEEDBACK FORM



USG Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) Regional Feed the Future Meeting Participant Feed-back and Evaluation - February 16, 2011

SESSION	MY EXPECTATIONS WERE MET ² (1 – 5)	LIST UP TO THREE PRIORITY CONCERNS, QUESTIONS, OR COMMENTS (Please print clearly)
Registration 7:30 – 8:00		
1. Welcome and Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome remarks Opening Introduction of participants and overview of agenda 8:00 – 8:30		
2. Update on the Bureau for Food Security (BFS) and Feed the Future Objective: Provide an update on BFS and the FTF Initiative 8:30 – 9:45		
3. Coffee Break 9:45 – 10:15		
4. Country Investment Plans for Central America		

² **1 = Strongly Disagree**; 2 = Somewhat Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Somewhat Agree; **5 = Strongly Agree**

Objective: Develop a common understanding of key principles and status within Central America focus countries 10:30 – 11:30		
--	--	--

SESSION	MY EXPECTATIONS WERE MET ³ (1 – 5)	LIST UP TO THREE PRIORITY CONCERNS, QUESTIONS, OR COMMENTS (Please print clearly)
5. Impact evaluation, performance monitoring, and reporting under FTF Objective: To discuss the FTF M&E approach and what it means for the field 11:15 a.m. – 12:30		
6. Lunch – Climate change and food security 12:30 – 1:30		
7. Food security and nutrition Objective: To discuss best practices on integrating nutrition in FTF programming across all USG programs		

³ **1 = Strongly Disagree**; 2 = Somewhat Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Somewhat Agree; **5 = Strongly Agree**

1:30 – 2:45		
<p>8. Gender and food security</p> <p>Objective: To share information on how results of gender assessment led to a concrete change in missions' strategy</p> <p>2:45 – 3:30</p>		

SESSION	MY EXPECTATIONS WERE MET ⁴ (1 – 5)	LIST UP TO THREE PRIORITY CONCERNS, QUESTIONS, OR COMMENTS (Please print clearly)
9. Coffee Break 3:30 – 4:00		
10. Improving the supporting environment for value chains Objective: Update on USAID Research and Development programs and how they apply to value chains (horticulture, coffee, and beans) and agribusiness and trade in the region 4:00 – 5:00		
11. USAID Forward and FTF Objective: To provide an overview of the agency's procurement reform and discuss the implications for FTF implementation 5:00 – 5:30		
12. Daily wrap-up 5:30 – 5:45		

Additional Comments:

⁴ **1 = Strongly Disagree**; 2 = Somewhat Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Somewhat Agree; **5 = Strongly Agree**



**USG Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) Regional Feed the Future Meeting
Participant Feed-back and Evaluation - February 17, 2011**

SESSION	MY EXPECTATIONS WERE MET ⁵ (1 – 5)	LIST UP TO THREE PRIORITY CONCERNS, QUESTIONS, OR COMMENTS (Please print clearly)
13. Overview of Agenda for Day 2 8:15 – 8:30		
14. Diplomacy, Policy Reform, and Messaging <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State's views on the multi-year strategy State's diplomacy role 8:30 – 9:30		
15. Private Sector Alliances within Feed the Future <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable CAFTA-DR alliances USAID alliances, past and present 		

⁵ **1 = Strongly Disagree**; 2 = Somewhat Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Somewhat Agree; **5 = Strongly Agree**

9:30 – 10:30		
16. Coffee Break 10:30 – 10:45		
17. Bilateral – Regional Synergy <i>Objective:</i> Discuss regional programming, including the USDA MOU for SPS 10:45 – 11:45		

SESSION	MY EXPECTATIONS WERE MET ⁶ (1 – 5)	LIST UP TO THREE PRIORITY CONCERNS, QUESTIONS, OR COMMENTS (Please print clearly)
18. Set up for lunch 11:45 a.m. – 12:15		
19. Lunch <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FTF Global Overview • E-CAM and Bilateral FTF Strategy Presentations 12:15 – 1:15		
20. Central American Integration System (SICA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role of SICA and its subsystems in food security and nutrition 		

⁶ **1 = Strongly Disagree**; 2 = Somewhat Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Somewhat Agree; **5 = Strongly Agree**

SESSION	MY EXPECTATIONS WERE MET ⁷ (1 – 5)	LIST UP TO THREE PRIORITY CONCERNS, QUESTIONS, OR COMMENTS (Please print clearly)
24. Coffee Break 3:00 – 3:30		
25. Meeting with Wal-Mart <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical meeting on proposed regional alliance 3:30 – 4:15		
26. Closing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wrap up Next steps 4:15 – 5:00		

Additional Comments:

⁷ **1 = Strongly Disagree**; 2 = Somewhat Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Somewhat Agree; **5 = Strongly Agree**

ANNEX 5: ACRONYMS USED IN THIS REPORT

ACRONYMS USED IN THIS REPORT

AO – Agreement Officer
APS – Annual Program Statements
AOTR – Agreement Officer’s Technical Representative
BFS – Bureau of Food Security
BMP – Best Management Practices
CAFTA – Central America Free Trade Alliance
CDCS – Country Development Cooperation Strategy
CGIAR – Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIP – Country Investment Plan
CO – Contracting Officer
COM-Chief of Mission
COTR – Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative
CRSP – Collaborative Research Support Program
DCM – Deputy Chief of Mission
DR – Dominican Republic
ECAM – El Salvador, Central America, and Mexico
EG – Economic Growth
EU – European Union
FAS – Fund Accountability Statement
FFP – Food For Peace
FtF – Feed the Future
FOB – Fixed Obligation Grants
GAP – Good Agricultural Practices
GAFSP – Global Agriculture and Food Security Program
GDA – Global Development Alliance
GMO – Genetically Modified Organisms
Ha – Hectar (1 hectar = 2.47 acres)
HAZ – Height-for-Age z-score (Indicator for nutritional stunting when HAZ <-2)
IA – Impact Assessments
IECA – International Erosion Control Association
IFPRI – International Food Policy Research Institute
IPM – Integrated Pest Management
IQC – Indefinite Quantity Contract
LAC – Latin America and the Caribbean
MCC – Millennium Challenge Corporation
MDG – Millennium Development Goal (MDG1 is Reduced Poverty)
M&E – Monitoring and Evaluation
MOU – Memorandum of Understanding
NGOs – Non-Government Organizations
PESA / FAO – *Programa Especial de Seguridad Alimentaria* / The Special Program for Food Security – Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
PIO – Public International Organization
PPL – Policy, Planning, and Learning
PRESANCA – *Programa Regional de la Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional para Centroamérica* / Regional Program for Food Security and Nutrition for Central America
R&D – Research and Development
RFA – Request for Application

RFP – Request for Proposal
RSD – Regional Sustainable Development
SICA – *Sistema de Integración Centroamericano* / Central American Integration System
SME – Small and Medium Enterprise
SUN – Scaling Up Nutrition
TDY – Temporary Duty
TIES – Training, Internships, Exchanges, and Scholarships (USAID/Mexico)
UNICEF – United Nations International Children’s Fund
USAID – United States Agency for International Development
USDA – United States Department of Agriculture
USG – United States Government
USTR – United States Trade Representative
WAZ – Weight-for-Age z-score (universal growth faltering indicator when WAZ < -2)
WHZ – Weight-for-Height z-score (acute malnutrition indicator when WHZ < -2)
WB – World Bank